REMARKS

Claims 1-10, as amended, remain herein.

Minor, editorial changes have been made in claims 1-10.

1. Claims 1-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by Mori et al. U.S. Patent 6,628,137.

The presently claimed ancillary equipment for testing a semiconductor integrated circuit, includes (1) a device measuring unit including a measuring section and an analyzing section, the measuring section for exchanging a signal with a device to be measured, which device includes a semiconductor integrated circuit mounted on a device measuring unit circuit board, the analyzing section for analyzing information from the measuring section by using a programmable device, and (2) a control/communication card including a board different from the device measuring unit circuit board, the control/communication card being connected to the device measuring unit to control the device measuring unit and for carrying out communication with a general-purpose computer. This arrangement is nowhere disclosed or suggested in the cited reference.

The presently claimed control/communication card is located on a board different from a board where the device measuring unit is located.

The Office Action cites Mori et al. '137 as allegedly disclosing ancillary equipment for testing a semiconductor integrated circuit including a device measuring unit 21 with a measuring section 23 and an analyzing section 25, and a separate card 20 allegedly corresponding to applicants' control/communication card for communicating with computer 45,46. Actually, Mori et al. '137, column 5, lines 6-9, describes element 20 as a test ancillary device located on a test ancillary board, as shown in Fig. 4a, and accordingly, element 20 is not a board. Also, Fig. 4a shows the Mori et al. '137 device measuring unit 23 and the control/communication card, which includes control card 24 in Fig. 4a and power supply 27, as being located on the same board 21. Accordingly, the Mori et al. '137 control/communication card 24/27 is not located on a board different from a board where the device measuring unit 23 is located, as recited in applicants' claim 1.

Regarding applicants' claim 2, the Office Action describes control/communication card 20 as allegedly including a memory section 26, and thus corresponding to applicants' data input section. Mori et al. '137 does not say that. There is no description anywhere in Mori et al. '137 disclosing memory section 26 performing a data input function. Mori et al. '137 does not disclose the control/communication card including a data input section for acquiring data from the device measuring unit, a control signal output section for transmitting a control signal to the device measuring unit, and an interface for exchanging a signal, as recited in applicants' claim 2.

Regarding applicants' claim 3, the Office Action describes interface 28 as allegedly corresponding to applicants' program writing port for input of a program to be written on the programmable device, and memory section 26 as allegedly corresponding to applicants' programmable device on which a program is to be written by interface 28. Actually, there is no description anywhere in Mori et al. '137 disclosing interface 28 as functioning as writing port for writing a program on memory section 26, i.e., Mori et al. '137 does not disclose a program

writing port to allow a program to be written on the programmable device, as recited in applicants' claim 3.

Regarding applicants' claim 5, the Office Action describes interface 28 as allegedly corresponding to applicants' connecter connecting the device measuring unit to a substrate having a socket for mounting a DUT. Actually, there is no description anywhere in Mori et al. '137 disclosing interface 28 as being the connector for a DUT board 10 that is the substrate having a socket for mounting the DUT, i.e., Mori et al. '137 does not disclose a first connector for connection via a cable with a substrate having a socket for mounting a device to be measured, and a second connector for insertion directly into the substrate, as recited in applicants' claim 5.

Regarding applicants' claim 7, the Office Action describes AD/DA measurement section 23 as allegedly corresponding to applicants' device measuring unit diagnosing unit. But, there is no description anywhere in Mori et al. '137 disclosing AD/DA measurement section 23 for transmitting a diagnostic signal to BOST board 21. Also, as can be seen from Mori et al. '137, Figs. 1-4, AD/DA measurement section 23 does not transfer

diagnostic data from BOST board 21, i.e., Mori et al. '137 does not disclose transferring diagnostic result data from the device measuring unit, as recited in applicants' claim 7.

Regarding applicants' claim 8, the Office Action describes BOST device 20 and BOST board 21 as allegedly corresponding to applicants' plurality of device measuring units. Actually, BOST Device 20 and BOST board 21 are not completely the same, and there is no description anywhere in Mori et al. '137 disclosing or suggesting that a test can be conducted using one or more of them, as recited in applicants' claim 8.

Regarding applicants' claim 10, the Office Action describes socket 12 as allegedly corresponding to applicants' socket for mounting thereon a device to be measured. But, socket 12 is not located on BOST device 20 or BOST board 21, but instead, is located in the DUG board.

For the foregoing reasons, Mori et al. '137 fails to disclose all elements of applicants' claimed invention, and therefore is not a proper basis for rejection under §102. And, there is no disclosure or teaching in Mori et al. '137 that would have suggested the desirability of modifying any portions

thereof effectively to anticipate or suggest applicants' presently claimed invention. Claims 2-10, which depend from claim 1, are allowable for the same reasons explained herein for claim 1. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

All claims 1-10 are now proper in form and patentably distinguished over all grounds of rejection stated in the Office Action. Accordingly, allowance of all claims 1-10 is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner deem that any further action by the applicants would be desirable to place this application in even better condition for issue, the Examiner is requested to telephone applicants' undersigned representatives.

Respectfully submitted,

PARKHURST & WENDEL, L.L.P.

January 25, 2005
Date

Roger W. Parkhurst
Registration No. 25,177
Robert N. Wieland
Registration No. 40,225

RWP:RNW/jmz

Attorney Docket No.: YMOR:300

PARKHURST & WENDEL, L.L.P.
1421 Prince Street, Suite 210
Alexandria, Virginia 22314-2805
Telephone: (703) 739-0220

PLEASE ACCEPT THIS AS AUTHORIZATION TO DEBIT OR CREDIT FEES TO DEP. ACCT. 16-0331 PARKHURST & WENDEL